

Office Action dated: September 23, 2004  
Reply filed: December 23, 2004  
Art Unit 2871

Appl. No. 09/589,881  
Docket No. 3430-0105P  
Page 9 of 14

### **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 14-21 and 23-24 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

### **ATTACHMENT TO OFFICE ACTION**

The Examiner has referred to an attachment in at least three places in the Office Action. Applicant has not received such an attachment. The Examiner is requested to provide a copy of this attachment with the next Action to make the Examiner's position more clear. It is believed that the attachment is intended to describe the directions of the light in the Shinji et al. reference.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 14-21 and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Shinji et al. (6259854). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Shinji et al. device includes a light source 1, a reflector 4 and a light directing member 3. Claim 1 states that the light directing member directs

incident light from the light source toward the reflector outwardly along an orthogonal direction. In response to this language, the Examiner now states that Shinji et al. also shows the direction of incident light toward the reflector and specifically refers to light ray L4. Although the Applicant does not have the advantage of the attachment where the Examiner indicates this direction, the Applicant sees that in Fig. 3D light ray L4 extends through the top of the light directing member. It is pointed that claim 1 states that the light is directed "toward the reflector outwardly along an orthogonal direction". Since the reflector is 4, the Applicant submits that it is not possible for light ray L4 to be directed "toward the reflector". Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by this reference.

Furthermore, regarding the final phrase of claim 1, that the light reflected is uniform, the Examiner refers to statements in the reference regarding the goal of the invention. The Examiner also refers to Figs. 5 and 6 to show that the angle is near  $0^\circ$ . However, as pointed out previously, Column 7, lines 5 to 11 indicate that when the angle is  $0^\circ$  or  $2^\circ$ , the scattering reflection efficiency is bad. Thus, the reference includes this example to show that the goal of uniform light reflection is not met. Thus, the Applicant submits that the mere fact that the goal of the reference device is to have the light be uniform does not meet the terms of the claim, where the reference

Office Action dated: September 23, 2004  
Reply filed: December 23, 2004  
Art Unit 2871

Appl. No. 09/589,881  
Docket No. 3430-0105P  
Page 11 of 14

specifically teaches against this uniformity for the specific angles claimed. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is further allowable.

Claim 11 is an independent claim which also includes the same language regarding the uniform light reflection and the direction of the light to the reflector outwardly along an orthogonal direction. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 11 is also allowable for the same reasons recited above in regard to claim 1.

Claim 21 is also an independent claim and also includes the same language. Accordingly, the Applicants submits that this claim is likewise allowable for the same reasons recited above in regard to claim 1.

Claim 2-4, 6-9, 14-20 and 23-24 depend from these allowable independent claims and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features which make them additionally allowable. Accordingly, these claims are also considered to be allowable.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Funamoto et al. (EP 08878720). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner points out that this reference shows a display panel 102, a reflector 103, light source 2 and a light directing member 11. The Applicant submits that claim 10 is not anticipated by this reference.

In the reference, the reflector 103 is disposed under the liquid crystal display panel 102, as seen in Figure 10. This differs from the arrangement of the present invention where the reflector is actually formed in the LCD panel. In fact, the reflector may be formed in each pixel region on the lower substrate of the LCD device and functions as an electrode. Claim 10, as presented in the previous Amendment states that the display panel includes 2 substrates with liquid crystal sandwiched therebetween and a reflector. Thus, the reflector is “included” in the display panel. This differs from the reference where the reflector is a separate part and not “included” in the display panel. The Applicant submits that the previous language of claim 10 thus defines over this reference. However, to emphasize the difference, the Applicant has added the language “in the display panel” to emphasize this arrangement. Since the reference does not show the reflector “in” the display panel, but rather disposed under the display panel, the Applicant submits that claim 10 defines over this reference.

#### **ENTRY OF AMENDMENT**

It is respectfully requested that the present Amendment should be entered into the official file in view of the fact that the Amendments automatically place the application in condition for allowance. Alternatively, if

Office Action dated: September 23, 2004  
Reply filed: December 23, 2004  
Art Unit 2871

Appl. No. 09/589,881  
Docket No. 3430-0105P  
Page 13 of 14

the Examiner does not agree that the application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the present Amendment should be entered for the purpose of appeal. The only Amendment currently being submitted is in claim 10. This limitation is already present in the existing language of claim 10 and is merely made to emphasize this point. Accordingly, a new issue is not involved. Furthermore, the Applicant notes that the rejection of claim 10 is a new rejection and accordingly the Applicant should be entitled to at least one opportunity to amend the claim.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Office Action dated: September 23, 2004  
Reply filed: December 23, 2004  
Art Unit 2871

Appl. No. 09/589,881  
Docket No. 3430-0105P  
Page 14 of 14

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Joseph A. Kolasch (Reg. No. 22,463)

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

*10/1* JAK/RFG/te  
**3430-0105P**